arXiv:1511.09050v1 [cs.SI] 29 Nov 2015

Rank me thou shalln't Compare me

Akrati Saxena, Vaibhav Malik, S. R. S. Iyengar
{akrati.saxena, vaibhav.malik, sudarshan}@iitrpr.ac.in

Department of Computer Science,
Indian Institute of Technology Ropar, India

Abstract. Centrality measures are used to quantify the importance of a node in a given complex network. In the present work, we calculate the degree centrality ranking of a node without having entire network. The proposed method uses degree centrality value of the node and few network parameters to calculate ranking of a node. These network parameters are total number of nodes, minimum, maximum and average degree of the network. These parameters are calculated using sampling method. The proposed method is validated on Barabasi-Albert model. Simulation results show that the method gives good performance for higher degree nodes and it is decreased for lower degrees.

1 Introduction

Complex networks have attracted researchers from the last few years. Complex networks [1] have been the part of our day to day life, such as friendship networks [2], collaborator networks [3], World Wide Web [4], Internet [5], biological networks [6] etc. In complex networks, objects are represented by nodes and relationship between nodes is represented by an edge connecting these two nodes. Researchers are studying the evolving phenomenon and properties of these networks from a fairly long time. In 1999, Barabasi and Albert proposed the first model (BA model) to explain the evolving mechanism of real world complex networks [7]. This model is based on *rich get richer* phenomenon, where a high degree node is more attractive to get new connections. Thus a network has few high degree nodes called hubs followed by some small degree ones. There are more number of nodes having loser degrees and they lie on periphery of the network.

All real world complex networks are sparse and follow some properties, such as small world phenomenon (six degree separation) [8–10], scale free degree distribution [7], preferential attachment [11, 12], high clustering coefficient [13, 14]. Each property shows a different aspect of these networks, such as small world phenomenon shows that no two nodes are far from each other. Real world networks have high clustering coefficient, that shows how tightly knit a node is in its neighborhood. In friendship networks, a user has high probability to be friend with friends of its friends because of high trust factor and frequent encounters. This gives birth to high clustering coefficient due to increase in the number of

triangular links. Triangle count distribution also follows power law in complex networks.

Except these properties, each node also has some unique characteristics that distinguish it from other nodes, called centrality measures. There are some centrality measures, that can be calculated using local information of the node like degree centrality [15] and semi-local centrality measure [16]. Others uses global information of the network like closeness centrality [17], betweenness centrality [18], eigenvector centrality [19], katz centrality [20] and so on. These properties are used to show the importance of a node in the given network under different contexts. Calculation of different centrality measures based on global structure of the network is very costly. It has motivated researchers to propose approximation algorithms to calculate these centrality measures. These algorithms use different sampling techniques and local information of the nodes. Algorithms to study different parameters using random walk or sampling methods are proposed by [21–27]. These approaches are storage efficient, as we only collect few data samples and store them.

In this work, we calculate ranking of a node based on degree centrality value. Ranking of a node can be used to give information about the relative importance of that particular node. This can be of high use in some contexts like in social networks, each person would like to know about her degree ranking to understand how strong she is in the network. A node having more neighbors is stronger and has high ranking. Similarly in WWW network, degree centrality ranking of a node can be used to show the relative importance of a particular article or topic, that is associated with that webpage.

Degree centrality ranking of a node can be calculated by collecting degree centrality value of all nodes and sort them. But for this we should have complete information of the network. Size of complex networks is increasing exponentially with time. It is a very tedious task to collect and store complete data on a single system, and process it. In the present work, we calculate ranking of a node based on degree centrality using BA model. In real world networks, degree centrality follows power law distribution. We use the evolving process of real world networks and power law distribution to calculate the ranking of a node. Error in the estimated ranking is calculated as the modular difference in actual and estimated ranking. Simulation results show that there is very less error in the estimated ranking. Probabilistic method to estimate the degree ranking is proposed by A Saxena et al. [28]. As per the best of our knowledge, this is the first work of its kind. The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the properties of the BA model followed by the mathematical analysis of the degree centrality ranking. Section 3 shows experimental results and section 4 concludes the paper.

2 Model and Background

In this section, we introduce the mathematical analysis to calculate the approximated degree centrality ranking of a node. We use following notations in rest of

the paper. We assume that the given graph has n number of nodes. Minimum, maximum and average degree of nodes are represented by k_{min}, k_{max} and d_{avg} respectively. All these parameters are calculated using sampling method [26]. Degree centrality of a node u is denoted by k_u, that represents total number of neighbors of the node. Degree centrality ranking of a node u is defined as, $R_a(u) = \sum_{\forall v \neq u} X_{vu} + 1$, where X_{vu} is 1 when $deg(v) > deg(u)$ and 0 otherwise. It is also called actual degree centrality ranking in the complete graph. Estimated degree centrality ranking of a node u, is denoted by $R_p(u)$. Next we discuss the preferential attachment and power law degree distribution proposed by BA model.

2.1 BA Model

Barabasi and Albert proposed an evolutionary preferential attachment model for the formation of real world complex networks [7]. This model starts with a seed graph that contains n_0 disconnected nodes. At each time stamp, a new node is added and it is connected with m already existing nodes. The probability $\prod(k_u)$ of an existing node u to get new connection depends on the degree k_u of node u. It is defined as,

$$\prod(k_u) = \frac{k_u}{\sum_v k_v}$$

So, the nodes having higher degrees acquire more links over time, thereby skewing the distribution towards lower degree. Preferential attachment model gives rise to power law degree distribution, where probability of a node having degree k is $f(k)$, that is defined as,

$$f(k) = ck^{-\gamma} \tag{1}$$

where, γ is the power law exponent and for real world networks its range is $2 \leq \gamma \leq 3$. As the network grows, only a few nodes, called hubs, manage to get a large number of links.

2.2 Degree Ranking

In this section, we propose the mathematical analysis to estimate degree ranking in BA model. Consider graph $G(V, E)$, where $|V|$ is n, in which each node $u \in V$ picks its degree k_u from the below given distribution, independent of the degrees of other nodes. Probability that degree of node u is k, is defined as,

$$P(k_u = k) = f(k)$$

where, $f(k)$ is power law function from (1).

$f(k)$ contains two parameters c and γ. First we calculate the value of c. As we know, integrating $f(k)$ from k_{min} to k_{max}, where k_{min} is the minimum degree of a node and k_{max} is the maximum degree of a node, will be equal to 1.

$$\int_{k_{min}}^{k_{max}} f(k) = 1$$

$$c\frac{(k_{min})^{1-\gamma}+(k_{max})^{1-\gamma}}{\gamma-1} = 1$$

$$c = \frac{\gamma-1}{(k_{min})^{1-\gamma}+(k_{max})^{1-\gamma}}$$

To calculate the value of γ, we use average degree d_{avg} of the network. Average degree can be written as,

$$d_{avg} = \int_{k_{min}}^{k_{max}} kf(k)$$

$$d_{avg} = \int_{k_{min}}^{k_{max}} kck^{-\gamma}$$

On integrating, it is,

$$d_{avg} = c\frac{k_{max}^{\gamma-2}-k_{min}^{\gamma-2}}{\gamma-2}$$

Using value of c, the equation will be,

$$d_{avg} = \frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma-2}(\frac{k_{max}^{\gamma-2}-k_{min}^{\gamma-2}}{k_{max}^{\gamma-1}-k_{min}^{\gamma-1}})(k_{max}k_{min})$$

where, $k_{min} << k_{max}$ and $2 \leq \gamma \leq 3$ for social networks and BA model,

$$d_{avg} = \frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma-2}\frac{k_{max}^{\gamma-2}}{k_{min}^{\gamma-2}}(k_{min}k_{max})$$

$$d_{avg} = \frac{\gamma-1}{\gamma-2}k_{min}$$

$$\text{i.e. } \gamma = 2 + \frac{k_{min}}{d_{avg}-k_{min}}$$

After calculating all parameters, rank of a node u of degree k, $R_p(u)$, can be written as,

$$R_p(u) = n - n\int_{k_{min}}^{k} f(k)$$

On integrating,

$$R_p(u) = n(1 - c\frac{k_{min}^{1-\gamma}-k^{1-\gamma}}{\gamma-1})$$

using value of c, ranking will be,

$$R_p(u) = n(1 - \frac{k_{min}^{1-\gamma}-k^{1-\gamma}}{k_{min}^{1-\gamma}-k_{max}^{1-\gamma}})$$

$$R_p(u) = n(\frac{k^{1-\gamma}-k_{max}^{1-\gamma}}{k_{min}^{1-\gamma}-k_{max}^{1-\gamma}})$$

$$R_p(u) = (\frac{n}{k_{min}^{1-\gamma}-k_{max}^{1-\gamma}})k^{1-\gamma} - (\frac{nk_{max}^{1-\gamma}}{k_{min}^{1-\gamma}-k_{max}^{1-\gamma}})$$

$$R_p(u) = ak^{1-\gamma} + b$$

where, a and b are constants for a given network.



Fig. 1. Plots of actual and estimated ranking on BA model. Network has a)10000 b)30000 c)50000 d)70000 e)90000 number of nodes and each node makes 10 connections when it joins the network.

3 Simulation Results

We create synthetic networks of different sizes using BA model, where each new coming node makes $m = 10$ connections. To verify the proposed method for estimating degree centrality ranking, we plot actual and estimated degree ranking for generated networks. Total number of nodes, minimum, maximum and average degree of nodes are estimated using sampling technique. According to the method, highest degree node has ranking 1.

It can be observed in Fig. 1, that prediction for higher degree nodes is more accurate than the lower degree nodes. This difference occurs because we assume that the nodes of all degrees are present and integrate the function to calculate the ranking, but it does not happen in real world networks. Table 1 shows average difference and standard deviation of modular differences between actual and estimated ranking for the networks of different sizes.

Table 1. Error in the Actual and Predicted Ranking

Number of Nodes	Average Error	Standard Deviation
10000	530.80	466.67
30000	1613.35	1400.92
50000	2684.37	2355.16
70000	3782.58	3304.09
90000	4860.14	4254.90

4 Conclusion

In this work, we have proposed a method to estimate the degree centrality ranking of a node without having the entire network. The proposed method is based on power law exponent of the degree distribution of the network. This work can also be of great use, when one need to compare degree centrality ranking of few nodes without calculating the ranking of all nodes.

In future, we will improve the proposed method to estimate the ranking within some lower and upper bound with high probability. We will also validate efficiency of the method on real world networks. It will be a good direction to work further, if one can use local information to predict the global ranking of a node based on different centality measures, such as betweenness centrality, closeness centrality, Page Rank and so on.

References

1. Yaneer Bar-Yam. *Dynamics of complex systems*, volume 213. Addison-Wesley Reading, MA, 1997.

2. Stanley Wasserman and Katherine Faust. *Social network analysis: Methods and applications*, volume 8. Cambridge university press, 1994.
3. Mark EJ Newman. The structure of scientific collaboration networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 98(2):404–409, 2001.
4. Réka Albert, Hawoong Jeong, and Albert-László Barabási. Internet: Diameter of the world-wide web. *Nature*, 401(6749):130–131, 1999.
5. Bernardo A Huberman and Lada A Adamic. Internet: growth dynamics of the world-wide web. *Nature*, 401(6749):131–131, 1999.
6. Leland H Hartwell, John J Hopfield, Stanislas Leibler, and Andrew W Murray. From molecular to modular cell biology. *Nature*, 402:C47–C52, 1999.
7. Albert-László Barabási and Réka Albert. Emergence of scaling in random networks. *science*, 286(5439):509–512, 1999.
8. Stanley Milgram. The small world problem. *Psychology today*, 2(1):60–67, 1967.
9. Jeffrey Travers and Stanley Milgram. An experimental study of the small world problem. *Sociometry*, pages 425–443, 1969.
10. Mark EJ Newman. Models of the small world. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 101(3-4):819–841, 2000.
11. Mark EJ Newman. Clustering and preferential attachment in growing networks. *Physical Review E*, 64(2):025102, 2001.
12. Hawoong Jeong, Zoltan Néda, and Albert-László Barabási. Measuring preferential attachment in evolving networks. *EPL (Europhysics Letters)*, 61(4):567, 2003.
13. Mark EJ Newman. The structure and function of complex networks. *SIAM review*, 45(2):167–256, 2003.
14. Konstantin Klemm and Victor M Eguiluz. Highly clustered scale-free networks. *Physical Review E*, 65(3):036123, 2002.
15. Marvin E Shaw. Some effects of unequal distribution of information upon group performance in various communication nets. *Journal of abnormal and social psychology*, 49(4):547–553, 1954.
16. Duanbing Chen, Linyuan Lü, Ming-Sheng Shang, Yi-Cheng Zhang, and Tao Zhou. Identifying influential nodes in complex networks. *Physica a: Statistical mechanics and its applications*, 391(4):1777–1787, 2012.
17. Gert Sabidussi. The centrality index of a graph. *Psychometrika*, 31(4):581–603, 1966.
18. Linton C Freeman. A set of measures of centrality based on betweenness. *Sociometry*, pages 35–41, 1977.
19. Karen Stephenson and Marvin Zelen. Rethinking centrality: Methods and examples. *Social Networks*, 11(1):1–37, 1989.
20. Leo Katz. A new status index derived from sociometric analysis. *Psychometrika*, 18(1):39–43, 1953.
21. Stephen J Hardiman and Liran Katzir. Estimating clustering coefficients and size of social networks via random walk. In *Proceedings of the 22nd international conference on World Wide Web*, pages 539–550. International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee, 2013.
22. Anirban Dasgupta, Ravi Kumar, and D Sivakumar. Social sampling. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 235–243. ACM, 2012.
23. Maciej Kurant, Carter T Butts, and Athina Markopoulou. Graph size estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1210.0460*, 2012.
24. Liran Katzir, Edo Liberty, and Oren Somekh. Estimating sizes of social networks via biased sampling. In *Proceedings of the 20th international conference on World wide web*, pages 597–606. ACM, 2011.

25. Colin Cooper, Tomasz Radzik, and Yiannis Siantos. Estimating network parameters using random walks. *Social Network Analysis and Mining*, 4(1):1–19, 2014.
26. Anirban Dasgupta, Ravi Kumar, and Tamas Sarlos. On estimating the average degree. In *Proceedings of the 23rd international conference on World wide web*, pages 795–806. ACM, 2014.
27. Oded Goldreich and Dana Ron. Approximating average parameters of graphs. *Random Structures & Algorithms*, 32(4):473–493, 2008.
28. Akrati Saxena, Vaibhav Malik, and SRS Iyengar. Estimating the degree centrality ranking of a node. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1511.05732*, 2015.